2	JEFFREY S. KRAMER, State Bar No. 094049 SANDRA CALIN, State Bar No. 100444 KRAMER, DEBOER & KEANE A Limited Liability Partnership Including Professional Corporations 27001 Agoura Road, Suite 350 Calabasas, California 91301 Tel: (818) 657-0255 - Fax: (818) 657-0256 jkramer@kdeklaw.com; scalin@kdeklaw.com Attorneys for Defendants, DARRICK ANGELONE, AONE CREATIVE, LLC and ON CHAIN INNOVATIONS, LLC		
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
9	CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
10			
11 12	HIDDEN EMPIRE HOLDINGS, LLC; a Delaware limited lability company; HYPER ENGINE, LLC; a California	Case No. 2:22-cv-06515-MWF-AGR Action Filed: September 12, 2022	
13	limited liability company; DEON TAYLOR, an individual,	DEFENDANTS' MOTION IN LIMINE #5 TO LIMIT TRIAL	
14	Plaintiffs, v.	TESTIMONY OF EXPERTS TO OPINIONS TESTIFIED TO IN DEPOSITION	
15 16	DARRICK ANGELONE, an individual; AONE CREATIVE, LLC	Pre-Trial Conference: December 22,	
17	formerly known as AONE ENTERTAINMENT LLC, a Florida limited liability company; ON CHAIN	2025 Trial Date: January 13, 2026	
18 19	INNOVATIONS, LLC, a Florida limited liability company,	Time: 8:30 a.m. Dept.: 5A	
20	Defendants.		
21			
22	COMES NOW, Defendants DARRICK ANGELONE, AONE CREATIVE,		
23	LLC and ON CHAIN INNOVATIONS, LLC, [hereinafter referred to collectively as		
24	"AONE"] by and through their attorneys of record, and submit this Motion in Limine		
25	to limit testimony by experts to those opinions testified to in deposition.		
26	INTRODUCTION		
27	Plaintiff's expert Erin Burke has not been deposed as of the filing of this Motion		
28	Trainer 5 expert Erm Barke has not been deposed as of the ming of this wibtion		

3 4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

1

2

in Limine, however she will be deposed prior to the hearing of this Motion. It is expected that Ms. Burke will offer certain testimony and opinions based on her work in this case to date. By this Motion in Limine, Defendants ask the Court to limit her testimony at trial to those opinions testified to in deposition, and to limit her testimony to that evidence and documents relied upon for her opinions at her deposition.

LEGAL ARGUMENT

The use of expert testimony is governed by Federal Rules of Evidence 701 – 706 regarding the matters within the purview of expert testimony. Once an expert is deposed and states certain opinions, and testifies that the opinions at the time of deposition are all of the opinions formed, it would be patently unfair to then allow the expert to state new opinions at trial which were not stated in deposition. See, e.g. Meyers v. City of Hermosa Beach (2009) 2009 U.S.Dist. LEXIS 142357.

In Jones v. Moore (2000) 80 Cal.app.4th 557, 565, the Court held that exclusion at trial of an expert witness's opinions beyond those expressed in deposition was justified. The Court stated: "When an expert deponent testifies as to specific opinions and affirmatively states that those are the only opinions he intends to offer at trial, it would be grossly unfair and prejudicial to permit the expert to offer additional opinions at trial." Id.

Therefore, the Court should limit the testimony of Plaintiffs' expert to those matters - documents and evidence - reviewed prior to her deposition and to the opinions testified to at deposition. As was stated in Gallo v. Peninsula Hospital (1985) 164 Cal. App. 3d 899, 903, "[t]he need for pretrial discovery as an aid to the preparation of cross-examination and rebuttal is greater with respect to the expert witness than it is in the case of an ordinary fact witness." As such, the Federal Rules require the pretrial disclosure of an expert's complete and final opinions [Rule 26(a)(2)(B)] and the expert may be deposed regarding those opinions and the bases for the same. To allow an expert to then form new opinions, or based the opinions on new documents or evidence, would be highly prejudicial and contrary to the Federal Rules and their intended purpose.

V. CONCLUSION

Based on the foregoing, Defendants respectfully request that the Court grant this Motion in Limine and order that experts are to be limited to testimony at trial to those matters testified to in their deposition.

DATED: December 1, 2025

KRAMER, DEBOER & KEANE

By:

JEFFREY S. KRAMER SANDRA CALIN

Attorneys for Defendants DARRICK ANGELONE, AONE CREATIVE, LLC, and ON CHAIN INNOVATIONS, LLC 1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I am employed in Los Angeles County, California. I am over the age of 18 and not a party to this action; my business address is 27001 Agoura Road, Suite 350, Calabasas, CA 91301. My email address is ynelson@kdeklaw.com.

I certify that on December 1, 2025, I served: **DEFENDANTS' MOTION PINIONS TESTIFIED TO IN DEPOSITION** on the following parties or counsel of record as follows:

Felton T. Newell, Esq.	Counsel for Plaintiffs
Newell Law Group PC	
1801 Century Park East, 24th Floor	
Phone (310) 556-9663	
E-mail: <u>felton@newellpc.com;</u>	
christine@newellpc.com	
Justin Kian, Esq.	Co-Counsel for Defendants
J.T. Fox, Esq.	
LAW OFFICES OF JT FOX, APC	
556 S. Fair Oaks Avenue, Suite 444	
Pasadena, California 91105	
Telephone: (888) 750-5530	
Fax: (888) 750-5530	
Email: jt@jtfoxlaw.com;	
justin@jtfoxlaw.com	

By ECF/CM: I electronically filed an accurate copy using the Court's Electronic Court Filing ("ECF") System and service was completed by electronic means by transmittal of a Notice of Electronic Filing on the registered participants of the ECF System.

I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the Unites States of America and the State of California that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed at Sherman Oaks, California on December 1, 2025

> <u>Yolanda N</u>elson Yolanda Nelson

https://kdeklawllp.sharepoint.com/sites/LACASES/Shared Documents/LACASES/66/6604/PLEADINGS/MIL 5.docx